D618
C532

The Divinity School News

THE DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Vol. XXVIII JUNE 1, 1961 No. 1

THE DIVINITY SCHOOL REBORN

EMBOSSED on the altar in Bond Chapel are two magnificent phoenixes. Derived from the classical myth of the bird that arose out of the ashes of death, this early Christian symbol of resurrection may —if we do not pursue the analogy too far—depict accurately the new significance of the Divinity School today.

For seventeen years the central energy of the Divinity School was given over completely to the Federated Theological Faculty. Because the academic life was the very heart of the existence of the Divinity School, it more than any of the other institutions in the Federation merged its identity in the Federated Theological Faculty. The Federation of Theological Schools is now dead, and out of the ashes of that Federation the Divinity School has emerged reborn.

All over the United States alumni, friends, and those interested in theological education ask: "What happened and what does the reborn Divinity School look like? What of its faculty and academic programs? What are its plans?"

Because of the differing explanations that can and have been given, it is difficult, if not impossible, to be entirely certain of just what did happen! However, since we have earned a point of view of our own, we owe it to our alumni to deliver briefly our version of the event. Suffice it to say that all the partners in the Federation agreed on how to operate under the 1953 Articles of Agreement except the Chicago Theological Seminary. It would not withdraw from the Federation or agree to the interpretation of the other three members. After months of difficult and futile negotiations, the three schools and the University withdrew together and presented the Chicago Theological Seminary with the formal three years' notice of withdrawal required by the 1953 Articles. It was hoped, under these circumstances, that the Federation would be terminated quickly before further damage was done.

It should be stated that each side thought it was acting in the way most honest to its own institutional and educational concerns. The Chicago Theo-

logical Seminary thought that it was protecting its denominational and educational responsibilities. The University, the Divinity School, and the other institutions thought that they were standing for University academic standards in theological education apart from denominational criteria yet with deep concern for ecumenical breadth. It was impossible to negotiate the differences.

On October 1, 1960, the Federation of Theological Schools came to an official end and the Federated Theological Faculty was dissolved. Strange reactions occurred throughout the theological world. Professors received inquiries "now that they were out of jobs." The fact was that the University stood responsible, through the Divinity School, for every man on the faculty according to the contract he held. Of course, each man was free to remain with the Divinity School or to go to another institution. All the faculty, except one instructor and three associate professors who elected to go to C.T.S., remained with the Divinity School. The names of the Divinity School Faculty are listed in this issue of the *News*.

Each school wrote a new separate contract with the University to replace the agreements that preceded the Federation. Each contract is different. The Disciples Divinity House virtually returned to a relationship which initially prevailed between it and the University. Disciples students take all their work with the Divinity School and receive the University D.B. Enrolled through the Disciples House, they are Divinity School D.B. students and candidates in every academic respect.

Meadville Theological School wrote a contract in which its students will take a minimum of 50 per cent of their academic program from the University's offering, and each one of their students will be approved by the Divinity School's standards for graduate theological study. Meadville will grant its own D.B. to its students and will make several appointments to a faculty of its own. However, the curriculum it actually has developed calls for 75 per cent of the students' work to be taken from University offerings and includes the hope of participating fully in the Divinity School's Internship program. Thus Meadville stands in a much closer relationship to the Divinity School than it did prior to 1943 but not so close as in the Federation.

The Chicago Theological Seminary wrote a contract in which it agreed to maintain a minimum of 25 per cent of the total student-hour enrolment which they had during the last year of the Federation. Such students as are enrolled into University classes have access to University facilities. Those not so enrolled have to pay a special fee to have such access. At its discretion, the Divinity School may allow students to take work at either Mead-

ville or C.T.S., as might be allowed for students in any other seminaries in the Chicago area.

It is important to note that this new arrangement, unlike the pre-1943 arrangements, is not built on reciprocity. There are no automatic reciprocal relations such as the exchange of credit for classes, joint listing of classes, or joint appointments. No longer are C.T.S. classes to be taught in the University or listed in University offerings. C.T.S. is giving its own degree with its own faculty and only supplements this with work taken from the University. It is clear that this contract opens a new phase in the relations between C.T.S. and the Divinity School.

The new contracts could be summarized this way: D.D.H. returns to its earlier relationship, which is closer than that of the 1943–60 Federation; Meadville Theological School is in a closer relationship than that prior to 1943 but not so closely related as in 1943–60; C.T.S. is in a far more autonomous relationship than has prevailed since its move to the South Side in 1915. It is hoped that these new arrangements will provide the most amicable circumstances possible in which each institution can carry out its work.

What are the implications of this for the Divinity School? The first thing to note is that the academic program remains fully intact. Steps have already been initiated to restore or add strength in all the academic fields. The Divinity School will always seek to maintain the best possible faculty in all the fields in which it gives degrees. It cannot cut back its program at any point, for it is dedicated to the development of its own rich heritage and again is alone responsible for the University's total program in theological education.

The ecumenical representation in the faculty and student body has not been weakened. The same number of denominations in faculty and student body is represented in the Divinity School as was in the Federated Theological Faculty. In fact, it would not be unfair to say that, with the exception of the several professors mentioned above, the entire Federated Theological Faculty and its various academic programs are now present in the reborn Divinity School. Even the D.B. internship program and its director, Professor T. Mallary Fitzpatrick, are now fully located in the Divinity School. Those students who originally enrolled into the joint D.B. through the Federation can, if they choose, complete that program under Mr. Fitzpatrick and the Divinity Faculty.

The second fact to note is the determination of the Divinity School to rebuild its own D.B. student body. We are convinced that in the new intern-

ship program the Divinity School has one of the finest D.B. programs available. It now seeks its own D.B. students for that program, though it wants no more than twenty-five to thirty B+ or better students per class. Granted the heavy A.M. and Ph.D. load and the extensive writing, research, and consultative schedule of the faculty, the Divinity School can afford to take only top-quality D.B. students. Furthermore, it must keep their numbers in balance with the students seeking other degrees. Already a systematic effort is being made slowly to build up the D.B. student body until the desired number and quality are achieved. We will need the help of alumni and friends in this very important aspect of our work.

This brings us to the third important consequence of the rebirth of the Divinity School. A determined effort will be made to develop our alumni relations. As long as the Divinity School was in the Federation, this was a difficult if not impossible task. The re-emergence of the Divinity School calls for a vigorous new effort to locate and enlist the interest, concern, and support of our alumni. The Divinity School has a heritage of which its alumni can be proud. Certainly, the School is justifiably proud of the reputation and achievements of its alumni. It counts among them many of the most distinguished scholars and professors of our generation. It is represented by faithful and vigorous ministers, missionaries, and teachers. You will soon be hearing more about our plans to develop the Divinity School's alumni activities.

There are many other things that ought to be said, but not all can be said at one time. Here the attempt has been made to sketch as quickly as possible the breakup of the Federation and the re-emergence of the Divinity School with its faculty and academic program intact. You now know what happened and where we are. We want to keep you informed of our new plans and hopes. We enlist the support of alumni and friends as we enter this new phase in the history of the Divinity School.

JERALD C. BRAUER

NEW ALUMNI MAGAZINE!

Beginning this fall the Divinity School will present to its alumni a new journal in theological thought. The format will be devoted to significant material from important addresses and papers delivered by outstanding alumni, the Divinity School Faculty, and guest preachers and lecturers at the University. Replacing the present *Divinity School News,* this new magazine together with a companion publication, *The Divinity School Newsletter,* will offer alumni a meaningful opportunity to participate in the life and work of the Divinity School.

WATCH FOR THE NOVEMBER ISSUE!

[The following sermon was preached in Joseph Bond Chapel on March 15, 1961, by Philip Hefner. Mr. Hefner is a student in the Divinity School studying toward the Ph.D. degree in the field of Christian Theology.—EDITOR.]

LAETARE, 1961

MY OWN personal observations lead me to conclude that the larger portion of us theologians and students of theology can be placed in either of two unhappy groups. If I might be allowed to exaggerate somewhat, I would describe them as follows.

The first group is characterized by the noble quest and the nervous struggle—the quest and struggle after truth—truth of every sort, but particularly that truth which will enable some kind of order in one's own personal enterprise, which will enable a man to make some sense out of his own existential journey so that he can negotiate a *modus vivendi* with reality and then get on to the business of living life with a minimum of guilt feelings and hypocrisy. Life and theology are pretty much a matter of rugged scrambling all the way for this group. Generally speaking, persons in this group muscle through—sooner or later—to some vision of the truth which does make their lives livable. Having once found an acceptable formula or vision of the truth, things begin to fall into place all along the line. Jesus Christ and the Christian faith have oftentimes been embarrassingly specific or unsophisticated to this group before the acceptable vision of truth has been hit upon. But now, following the breakthrough to truth, it is possible to accept Jesus Christ

and the faith of his church *because and insofar as Christ is commensurable with or subsumable under that vision of the truth.* Christ becomes an acceptable exemplification of that truth—oftentimes even the most acceptable exemplification. But, throughout its career, this first group holds in tension the characteristics of nobility and nervousness—*nobility,* because it insists that one must be concerned above all for truth wherever it may appear and for a life that is lived in accord with that truth, and *nervousness,* because it is haunted by the fear that truth might pass it by.

The second group is much more certain of its allegiance. It finds that its allegiance is such that it can affirm Jesus Christ, his Word of Scripture, his church and its faith as worthy objects in and of themselves—*for their own sakes.* Christ and the Christian faith or the Bible need no exterior referent to authenticate them for the members of this group. They find it possible to accept all things *because or insofar as they are commensurable with or subsumable under the body of faith which they associate with the Bible, or Jesus Christ, or the church.* Their allegiance to Christ and/or his church makes the encounter with truth remarkably easy. The body of faith given in Christ, creed, or canon represents a completely consistent, non-contradictory system of axioms or, one might say, a sanctified calculating machine. This system may be very simple or incredibly sophisticated; in either case it is consistent at all points. So the acceptability of any particular truth is readily discernible by subjecting it to the operations of this axiom system or calculating machine which is constituted by the faith. If it is commensurable with the axiom system, that is, if it comes out of the calculating machine with holes punched in the proper places, it is acceptable; if not, it cannot be judged as being true in any *significant* way. For this group, Christ is true because he is so Christocentric; the Bible is true because it is thoroughly biblical; the church is a true guide because it is so ecclesiologically oriented. This group is strong, because it knows that the Christian faith stands for something precise and definite. It cannot be reconciled with everything under the sun. If one is to be a Christian, this group rightly argues, or if one is to engage in Christian theology, then one must unashamedly agree to be identified as such and to stand in that position which is consistently and unmistakably Christian. Nevertheless, this group finds it to be a source of constant frustration that so many people and so much that calls itself *true* refuses to conform to the consistency of this system of axioms.

Now both these positions have a long and rich tradition. Each of them can marshal its arguments with cogency, and each is theoretically as well as

practically necessary. However, my suggestion is that the Christian faith makes its claim upon the minds and lives of men primarily on the basis of neither of these positions—neither on the basis of its commensurability with the truth which man's inquiring mind finds openly available outside the faith nor on the basis of an esoteric literature, cultus, or community which are automatically without referent, self-authenticating, and normative merely because they are called Christian by the right people at the right time. Rather, the proposition is this: *that the Christian faith asserts its claim chiefly on the basis of its demonstrable ability to persuade men that in the commitment to its Lord Jesus Christ is to be found the ultimately most adequate truth*—in the commitment to this Lord Jesus Christ, who is testified to in its canonical literature in the community which has been engendered by this persuasion. On the basis of its being *the only adequate truth,* the Christian faith says what it does—and on the basis of truth which is not esoteric and parochially consistent, but rather truth which is, in commitment, demonstrable, truth whose clear cogency waits upon one thing only—commitment to it. This is what enables nobility without nervousness, certainty without easy smugness—joy, in other words—because Christ is the Truth. In Christ there is to be found that which is demonstrably true in an ultimately adequate way.

It is important to see this in our text, the fifty-fifth chapter of Isaiah, and in its New Testament correlate, the sixth chapter of the Gospel of John. Let us examine the implications of the assertion which I have just made, according to the schema provided by the five strophes which comprise Isaiah, chapter 55. We need to remember that the prophet directed this passage to members of the convenant community, not to outsiders. These members of the community had been led into a rather comfortable exile by an impressive conqueror, and they seemed to have lost their sharp awareness that their God was truth and that he therefore offered to them the only adequate truth for their existence. This passage is for us, then—for us, the covenant community, Christians, students at this Divinity School.

The proposition is made to us in the first strophe:

> Ho, every one who thirsts, come to the waters;
> and he who has no money, come, buy and eat!
> Come, buy wine and milk without money and without price.
> Why do you spend your money for that which is not bread,
> and your labor for that which does not satisfy?
> Hearken diligently to me, and eat what is good,
> and delight yourselves in fatness.

This is the proposition of the God of both Testaments, the God who revealed himself in Jesus Christ, the God of our Faith—and the proposition is this: that our God makes his claim *as an ultimate truth-claim.* And its claim to truth is as truth which not only satisfies man's inquiring reason but which fulfils the inquiry of his total existence. Its truth claim is so broad, so far-ranging, and even materialistic that, according to the most recent English translation, in the New English Bible, when the disciples heard it, some responded in John 6:60, "This is more than we can stomach!" The claim is that our God offers the only water that can quench man's thirst in an ultimately satisfying way; that he offers the only wine and milk and bread that can fill man's need. Other bread is "not bread." Other satisfaction "does not satisfy." Good alone is what God offers—it alone brings fatness to the soul. The claim is not that this is *better* bread, *purer* water, *finer* wine, but that it is the *only* bread, milk, and wine—the *only* full truth. This is the breadth of our God's truth claim.

Our Christ is not Lord simply because he bears the title—what worship could he command then? And what is authoritative about his Bible? Why should the dictum, "It is unbiblical!" put an end to all further conversation? Of what use is the Bible if it is wrong? What confidence can we have in the church if it is wrong? Or in our saints? Or in our own religious experience? All these elements of our faith make their claim only as a truth-claim. Christocentricity, bibliocentricity, ecclesiocentricity—they are desirable only because they constitute the only way to ultimate *Truth*—at least that is their clear claim. And the apparently sacramental imagery of this first strophe would seem to extend that truth claim to the liturgy itself.

The second strophe elaborates on this truth claim:

> Incline your ear, and come to me; hear that your soul may live;
> and I will make with you an everlasting covenant,
> my steadfast, sure love for David.
> Behold, I made him a witness to the peoples,
> a leader and commander for the peoples.
> Behold you shall call nations that you know not,
> and nations that knew you not shall run to you,
> because of the Lord your God, and of the Holy One of Israel,
> for He has glorified you.

The claim is that God brings us into the covenant relationship with him—outside which there is no life. *The claim is also that the ultimate soundness of God's truth will command the respect of all truth-seekers.* This claim would seem to call for a proclamation of faith which we seldom see today

and for a confidence which we seldom meet. Ours is a nation and an age in which the growth of knowledge has been unparalleled. The first group which I mentioned is content to preach to this age the rather innocuous message that the Christian faith is at least *not contradicted* by this growth of secular knowledge. This evangel of non-contradiction scarcely constitutes Good News—to Christian or non-Christian! The second group seems content to say "We have *our* Bible, *our* Christ, *our* church, so why get involved with truth and knowledge?" Where is the confidence of Isaiah which would proclaim not only that all other truth is not contradicted but that it is incomplete, unconsummated except in our faith in our God? Where is the boldness today that can proclaim that God's wisdom is the ultimate end of philosophy, that Christ's love and healing is the consummation of the therapeutic arts, that the covenant community can not only co-operate with but illumine the goals of urban renewal? There are problems in such a proclamation, to be sure. But nevertheless, we need to be clear on just what that proclamation is. The proclamation is *not* just that all truth forms a seamless, non-contradictory whole, allowing Christian revelation to be one part of that whole. It is also that our God is *the ultimate and only truth.* The proclamation is not that ours is an esoteric truth for a few, but that it comprehends all truth in a demonstrable manner.

The third strophe makes it clear that the accessibility of this truth lies by the way of commitment to our God, the God who raised up our Lord Jesus Christ.

> Seek the Lord while he may be found, call upon him while he is near;
> let the wicked foresake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts;
> let him return to the Lord, that he may have mercy on him,
> and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.
> For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways,
> says the Lord.
> For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher
> than your ways and my thoughts than your thoughts.

From this it follows that the call of truth is at the same time a call for repentance and return to the God who is truth. This is a fact that speaks significantly to both of the groups which I have mentioned. To the one group it makes it clear that adherence to the Bible, the church, or the theology of the Word can be no substitute for personal repentance and turning to the Lord.

To the other group it makes it equally clear that any truth which claims ultimacy outside of commitment to our God in Christ is ultimately not

truth. If Christ and the faith which he has engendered attain credibility only as they are subsumable under the most up-to-date metaphysical inquiries or therapeutic insights, for example—then that Christ is not necessary, and it is dishonest to say that he is. The Christian faith claims that it is not only dishonest but impossible. I take this to be the point of recent statements by two theologians in this school: Mr. Paul Tillich, when he reiterated in his seminar that if Christ be the *logos,* then he is the apotheosis of truth wherever it may be found; and Mr. Bernard Meland, when he revealed that his own investigations in process metaphysics could not have achieved the truth they have apart from the insight that proceeded from his commitment to Christ.

"Seek the Lord while he may be found, call upon him while he is near"—that is the most immediate demand made by the truth-claim of our faith. It means to say that truth-seeking is ultimately fruitless apart from that commitment to Christ.

The final two strophes reinforce the truth-claim that has been made and the call to commitment that has been issued.

> For as the rain and the snow come down from heaven,
> and return not thither but water the earth,
> making it bring forth and sprout, giving seed to the sower and
> bread to the eater.
> so shall my word be that goes forth from my mouth;
> it shall not return to me empty,
> but it shall accomplish that which I purpose,
> and prosper in the thing for which I sent it.

The power of this truth-claim lies in the fact that the truth with which we are dealing has the ability to actualize itself. It demands commitment because truth is not full until the knower is taken up into the actuality of the truth he is seeking to know. As I said at the outset, the truth of the Christian faith is asserted on the basis of its demonstrable ability to *persuade men* that truth lies in commitment to Christ. Without the ability to persuade, the truth would not be the truth, because it could not be actual. And once the truth does actualize itself, that is, engender commitment to itself, then its ultimate truthfulness becomes clear. Then it becomes plain just how the various intellectual disciplines and the various practical avenues of existence all point to Christ as their consummation. The truth we hold in Christ has to do with the Word of God which is powerful, never returning empty, accomplishing that which God purposes.

> For you shall go out in joy, and be led forth in peace;
> the mountains and the hills before you shall break forth into singing,
> and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands.
> Instead of the thorn shall come up the cypress;
> instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle;
> and it shall be to the Lord for a memorial,
> for an everlasting sign which shall not be cut off.

The final exhibition of the truth claim of our faith lies in the salvation of the covenant community. This salvation is comprised of the peace which is the unity of the truth-seekers and all that they can know—all the created world in which they live—with truth itself, God. This unity is the only peace, the *shalom* of the Old Covenant, the *eirene* of the New Covenant. This unity constitutes a New Creation and a New Exodus from darkness. This unity constitutes the final actualization of truth itself which glorifies itself in becoming actual—becoming a memorial and an everlasting sign which shall not be cut off.

If it be the case that in Christ and in the commitment which he engenders the truth *has indeed* actualized itself, then our text speaks to both groups we mentioned at the outset. To those who seek restlessly for a general truth that will make Christ less offensive and more acceptable because he is subsumable under it, the Christian faith says, "Seek no longer to avoid Christ, because it is only in him that you shall find the general truth." To those who would make the Christian faith into an ecclesiology, a Christology, or a scripturology, this text reveals that these attempts, like all systems of non-contradictory axioms, cannot authenticate themselves except they reckon adequately with the demands of truth. Our Christian faith says, "The demands of truth cannot be obviated by clinging to these axiom systems. Rather, allegiance to these makes inevitable the encounter with truth and enables the victory of that truth over us."

I mean to have solved no problems this morning, and surely no one will accuse me of that. But I do mean to have made clear just what I believe the assertion of our Christian faith to be in respect to truth. Our Christian faith means to assert that in the revelation of our God in Jesus Christ there has been made a claim—not to a truth which is merely commensurable with all other truth—and not to an exclusive faith which is self-authenticating. Rather, the claim is that in Christ truth itself is calling to actualize itself by drawing men unto itself—truth without which other truth is not truth and without which Christian revelation is scarcely significant.

All over the world there are Christians for whom this is the week of the

fourth Sunday in Lent. During this week, the Church Catholic raises its eyes toward the cross of its Lord Jesus Christ on Black Friday and the Resurrection Faith of Easter, and in its traditional language it sings *Laetare* "Rejoice": "Rejoice ye with Jerusalem and be glad with her." Unless I am greatly mistaken, the Christian church rejoices because it sees in its Lord Jesus Christ and his covenant community the actualization of the only truth that can bring human minds and existence to their ultimate consummation. And if this be true, a divinity school, set in the heart of a great university, as it stands at the end of another academic term, should be able to understand with particular poignancy what it means to sing *"Laetare!"*— "Rejoice, for you shall go out in joy and be led forth in peace!"

PHILIP HEFNER

FROM THE DEAN'S DESK

CONVOCATION

At the Summer Convocation on September 2, 1960, the following degrees were conferred:

MASTER OF ARTS:

ROBERT P. GURUSWAMY
A.B., Madras Christian College, Tembaram, India, 1952

GORDAN LLOYD HARPER
A.B., Denison University, 1958

GILBERT RICHARD KERN
A.B., Findlay College, 1954
D.B., Winebrenner Seminary, 1957

VUKOSAVA MANDIC
S.B., George Williams College, 1955

MAURICE JARRELL MONTGOMERY
A.B., William Jewell College, 1958

THEODORE HALL PARTRICK
A.B., University of North Carolina, 1944
D.B., Virginia Theological Seminary, 1949

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY:

YOSHIO FUKUYAMA
A.B., Doane College, 1943
D.B., University of Chicago, 1950

At the Autumn Convocation on December 16, 1960, the following degrees were conferred:

MASTER OF ARTS:

NANCY MCFADDEN
A.B., University of North Carolina, 1957
A.M., *Ibid.*, 1958

DANIEL C. NOEL
A.B., Ohio Wesleyan University, 1958

EDWARD WHITTELSEY WARNER
A.B., Oberlin College, 1949
D.B., Western Theological Seminary, 1952

At the Winter Convocation on March 16, 1961, the following degrees were conferred:

MASTER OF ARTS:

EDWARD LEE DOWD
A.B., Northwest Nazarene College, 1946
D.B., Nazarene Theological Seminary, 1949

MYRON LESTER EBERSOLE
A.B., Goshen College, 1949

PHILIP JAMES HEFNER
A.B., Midland College, 1954
D.B., Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary, 1959

ERNEST THOMAS LAWSON
D.B., University of Chicago, 1958

ROBERT L. SIMPSON
A.B., Phillips University, 1955
D.B., *Ibid.*, 1958

BACHELOR OF DIVINITY:

MARY SUE DEISHER
A.B., Wilson College, 1956

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY:

JOSEPH ROBERT SHIVE
A.B., Illinois Wesleyan University, 1953
S.T.B., Boston University, 1956

FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL, 1961–62

R. Pierce Beaver, Ph.D., Professor of Missions.

Jerald C. Brauer, D.B., Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., Professor of Church History.

Mircea Eliade, Ph.D., Professor of History of Religions.

Robert McQueen Grant, Th.D., Professor of New Testament.

Bernard MacDougall Loomer, Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy of Religion.

Bernard Eugene Meland, D.B., Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Constructive Theology.

James Hasting Nichols, Ph.D., Professor of Modern Church History.

Jaroslav Jan Pelikan, D.B., Ph.D., D.D., Litt.D., Professor of Historical Theology.

John Coert Rylaarsdam, D.B., Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Old Testament Theology

Joseph Sittler, D.B., D.D., Professor of Theology.

Markus Barth, Th.D., Associate Professor of New Testament.

Daniel Thomas Jenkins, A.M., D.B., D.D., Associate Professor of Ecumenical Theology, (Spring, 1962).

Joseph Mitsuo Kitagawa, D.B., Ph.D., Associate Professor of History of Religions.

William Alvin Pitcher, D.B., Ph.D., Associate Professor of Ethics and Society.

Gibson Winter, D.B., Ph.D., Associate Professor of Ethics and Society.

Preston Thomas Roberts, Jr., Ph.D., Associate Professor of Theology and Literature.

Nathan A. Scott, Jr., D.B., Ph.D., Associate Professor of Theology and Literature.

Granger Ellsworth Westberg, D.B., D.D., Associate Professor of Religion and Health.

Allen Paul Wikgren, Ph.D., Associate Professor of New Testament Language and Literature.

Leroy H. Aden, A.M., D.B., Instructor in Pastoral Care.

Clarke A. Kucheman, A.B., D.B., A.M., Instructor in Ethics and Society.

Charles Houston Long, D.B., Instructor in History of Religions.

Richard G. Luman, A.B., A.M., Instructor in Church History.

Jay A. Wilcoxen, A.B., D.B., Instructor in Old Testament.

Carl Wennerstrom, A.B., D.B., Instructor in Pastoral Care.

Thomas Mallary Fitzpatrick, Jr., D.B., Research Associate in the Christian Ministry (Associate Professor).

Kyle Haselden, D.B., D.D., Professorial Lecturer in Homiletics.

Reuel L. Howe, B.A., S.T.B., S.T.M., S.T.D., D.D., Visiting Professorial Lecturer in Religion and Personality (Winter & Spring 1962).

Ernest R. Sandeen, A.B., A.M., Ph.D., Visiting Instructor in Church History (Autumn, 1961).

FROM THE DEAN'S DESK

FIELD CHAIRMEN

Bible
J. C. Rylaarsdam

Christian Theology
B. M. Loomer

Ethics and Society
G. Winter

History of Christianity
J. H. Nichols

History of Religions
M. Eliade

Religion and Art
P. T. Roberts, Jr.

Religion and Personality
W. A. Pitcher (*Acting Chairman*)

RESIGNATIONS

Seward Hiltner, Professor of Pastoral Theology, will leave the University of Chicago's Divinity School, September 1, 1961, to become Professor of Theology and Personality at Princeton Theological Seminary.

Perry Deyo Lefevre, Associate Professor of Theology and Education, will remain with the faculty of Chicago Theological Seminary upon his resignation from the Divinity School, June 30, 1961. He will be Academic Dean and Professor of Constructive Theology at C.T.S.

Sidney E. Mead, former President of Meadville Theological School and Professor of History of American Christianity, left the University October 1, 1960, to become Professor of American Church History at Southern California School of Theology, Claremont.

Victor Obenhaus, Associate Professor of the Church in Agricultural and Industrial Life, will resign from the Divinity School faculty, June 30, 1961. Mr. Obenhaus will remain with the Chicago Theological Seminary as Professor of Christian Ethics and Associate Director of Field Experience.

Ross Snyder, Iowa Associate Professor of Religious Education, will leave the Divinity School faculty on June 30, 1961; he will remain with the Chicago Theological Seminary, retaining the title of Professor of Religious Education.

PROMOTIONS

Professors William Alvin Pitcher and Gibson Winter have been promoted to the rank of Associate Professors in the field of Ethics and Society. In addition to his work in the Ethics Field, Professor Pitcher will serve as Acting Chairman in the Field of Religion and Personality; Professor Winter will serve as Chairman of the Ethics Field.

William N. Weaver, former assistant Dean of the Federated Theological Faculty, was appointed Associate Dean and Dean of Students in the Divinity School, July 1, 1960.

NEW APPOINTMENTS AND VISITING PROFESSORS

Reuel L. Howe, Director of the Institute for Advanced Pastoral Studies in

Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, will be a Visiting Professorial Lecturer in the field of Religion and Personality during the Winter and Spring Quarters, 1962.

Richard G. Luman has been appointed to the faculty of the Divinity School as an instructor in Church History. Mr. Luman, formerly an instructor in the Department of History at the State University of South Dakota, joined the Divinity School in the Winter Quarter of 1961.

In addition to Mr. Luman, two new instructors will join the faculty in the Autumn Quarter of 1961: Clark A. Kucheman, in the Ethics and Society Field, and Jay Wilcoxen in the Biblical Field.

Ernest Sandeen, will be visiting Instructor in Church History in the Autumn Quarter of 1961. Mr. Sandeen is a member of the History Faculty at North Park College in Chicago.

FACULTY NEWS

Leroy H. Aden, Instructor in Pastoral Care, gave two lectures to the Tri-College Faculty Meeting at Baker University on November 5. The lectures dealt with the principle and practice of a teacher as a counselor.

Mircea Eliade, Professor of History of Religions, lectured in Ascona on August 20 on "Structures religieuses" and from September 11 to 17 at the Tenth International Congress for History of Religion, Marburg, Germany. In February he presented a series of six lectures and seminars at Harvard Divinity School, Center for the Study of World Religions. Mr. Eliade is the author of four recently published books: *Schmiede und Alchemisten* (Stuttgart, 1960); *Myths, Dreams and Mysteries* (Harper, 1961); *Images and Symbols,* (Harrill Press, 1961); and *El Chamanismo y las técnicas del extasis* (Fondo de Cultura Economica, Mexico).

Seward Hiltner, Professor of Religion and Personality, presented lectures in January at Drew Theological Seminary and Lancaster Theological Seminary. In February he lectured at Princeton University and Lake Forest College. During March he presented the Weyerhaeuser Lectures at McCormick Theological Seminary.

Joseph M. Kitagawa, Assistant Professor of History of Religions, read a paper at the Tenth International Congress of History of Religions held at Marburg University, Germany, September 10–17. His book *Religions of the East* was published by the Westminister Press in October, 1960. Mr. Kitagawa spoke on "Buddhism in the Contemporary World" at the North Shore Congregation Israel, Glencoe, on February 1, 1961. On February 3, 1961, he addressed the Conference on Sociology of Religion, held under the auspices of the Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, at the University of Texas.

Bernard E. Meland, Professor of Theology, was elected president of the American Theological Society (Midwest Division) for the year 1960–61 at the spring meeting of the society.

James H. Nichols, Professor of Modern Church History, was awarded a Litt.D. degree by Franklin and Marshall College at the Founders' Day Celebrations on October 14. Mr. Nichols was one of the featured participants of the Second Liberal Arts Festival held on the Monmouth College campus, May 5, 6, and 7.

Jaroslav J. Pelikan, Professor of Historical Theology, delivered the Gheens Lectures, October 18–19, at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville. On October 24–26 he delivered the Gray Lectures at the Divinity School, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina. During January, Mr. Pelikan delivered a Convocation address at Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island; and he addressed the American Philosophical Society at the University of Pennsylvania in commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of the birth of Francis Bacon. From May 1 to 5, he lectured at a Lutheran Chaplain's Retreat in Berchtesgaden, Germany. Volume II of *Luther's Works* appeared during the fall under Mr. Pelikan's editorship, and Volume XXIV, containing Luther's sermons on the Gospel of St. John, will appear this spring. January 9 was the publication date of Mr. Pelikan's book *The Shape of Death* (Abingdon Press), which was featured in the January 20 issue of *Time* magazine.

Nathan A. Scott, Jr., Associate Professor of Religion and Art, delivered three lectures at Thiel College in Greenville, Pennsylvania, on September 29 and 30 under the general subject, "Literature and the Renewal of the Human Image in Mass Society." In December he delivered the Isabelle Kellog Thomas Lecture at Goucher College in Baltimore on "Literary Criticism at Midcentury." Professor Scott was ordained to the priesthood of the Episcopal church on December 17, 1960, at the Cathedral of St. James (Diocese of Chicago).

Joseph Sittler, Professor of Theology, delivered the Swander Lectures, January 25–26, at Lancaster Theological Seminary. On February 20–22 he presented three lectures at Muhlenberg College.

Granger Westberg, Associate Professor of Religion and Health, addressed the premedical and pretheological students at St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota, on November 5 and 6. He participated in the week-end symposium of the Academy of Religion and Mental Health at Arden House, Harriman, New York, November 19 and 20. During the month of January, Mr. Westberg conducted a week-end workshop for the dormitory staffs at the University of Wisconsin and a workshop in pastoral counseling for Arizona clergy. In December, 1960, the National Council of Christ in the U.S.A. elected Granger Westberg chairman of the Commission on Religion and Health, a three-year appointment.

ALUMNI NEWS

John E. Ayscue (B.D. '05) retired to Route 6, Raleigh, North Carolina, after teaching for thirty-three years in Campbell College.

Russell J. Becker (Ph.D. '50) has accepted the position as associate professor of pastoral theology at the Yale Divinity School. In addition to teaching in the field of pastoral care and counseling, he will be the director of the Pastoral Studies Program of Yale Divinity School.

Elliott H. Birdsall (B.D. '34) has accepted a call from the First United Church, Kelowna, British Columbia, to serve as pastor.

Richard C. Bush (Ph.D. '60) is now with the Christian Study Center on Chinese Religion, Tao Fong Shan, Shatin, N.T., Hong Kong, and teaches at Chung Chi College. He had previously been director of school-church relations and assistant professor of the history of religions, Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University.

Svante Bernhard Erling (A.M. '46) assistant professor of Christianity in Gustavus Adolphus College, has recently published *Nature and History: A Study of Theological Methodology with Special Attention to Motif Research.*

Virgil E. Foster (A.M. '26), now the editor of the *International Journal of Religious Education,* has had two books published within a period of eight months —in September, 1960, a juvenile book, *Close-Up of a Honeybee,* and in April, 1961, *By Deed and Design.*

Leeds Gulick (1928–29) has been transferred from his missionary work in Japan under the American Board to serve under the Board of International Missions (E and R Church) in Okinawa. The Reverend and Mrs. Gulick are "senior missionaries" in the Interboard Committee for Christian Work in Okinawa, with Mr. Gulick as the field representative of that Committee in New York.

Paul L. Higgins (D.B. '45), minister of the Hyde Park Methodist Church in Chicago, is the author of a new book, *John Wesley: Spiritual Witness,* published in the fall of 1960 by T. S. Denison and Company.

Clarence W. Kemper (A.M. '11, B.D. '12) observed the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination to the Christian ministry at the First Baptist Church of Boulder, Colorado, on October 6, 1960.

Boyd McCleary (1931) received an honorary D.D. degree from Hartwick College, Oneonta, New York. He has retired from the First Presbyterian Church of Oneonta, which he had served for twenty-four years.

David S. Noss (Ph.D. '52), on leave of absence from Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio, where he is professor of religion, is now serving as senior intern in oriental studies at Columbia University under a program made possible by the Carnegie Foundation.

William C. S. Pellowe (M.A. '21), new curator of Detroit Conference Historical Society, has recently published a collection of short stories, *Tales from a Lighthouse Cafe.*

Lloyd Wm. Putnam (A. M. '56) has accepted the position of associate minister of the Second Baptist Church of Germantown, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

DAPHNE SWARTZ (1928) has been appointed to the Missionary W.D.C.S. Board of Missions of the Methodist church to help direct girls' student hostels in Puebla, Mexico.

MARVIN J. TAYLOR (M.A. '49) has been promoted to associate professor at the University of Pittsburgh. His book, *Religious Education: A Comprehensive Survey,* was published in February by the Abingdon Press.

In Memoriam

[Professor Emeritus Chave died on May 15, 1961, at Billings Hospital, Chicago. On May 23, 1961, a Memorial Service was held at the First Unitarian Church of Chicago, 1174 East 57th Street, and the following memorial presentation was given by Dr. Charles T. Holman, Professor Emeritus of Pastoral Duties.—EDITOR.]

ERNEST JOHN CHAVE, 1886–1961

My first recollection of Ernest John Chave is that of a rather slight young man giving his all at football practice in my first year at McMaster University in Canada. He had lots of fight but insufficient weight for a place on the line. When winter came, however, and ice hockey was the game, his speed and skilful stickhandling made him more effective. In the meantime, in the classroom and in the social life of the university, I came to know him as an exceptionally able student and a warm personal friend, whose keen and analytic mind permitted him to take nothing that others said, even the professors, without critical appraisal, and whose companionship was valued by his fellow students.

At that time Ernest Chave was preparing for foreign missionary service. His wife's health, however, frustrated the fulfilment of that plan. Consequently, upon graduation from McMaster University, with the B.A. and B.Th. degrees in 1906 and 1910, respectively, he was ordained to the Christian ministry and became pastor of a Baptist church in Vancouver, British Columbia. He served overseas with the Canadian YMCA in World War I in 1918–19. From that wartime service he came to Chicago for graduate study in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago and earned the A.M. degree in 1920 and the Ph.D. in 1924. While still completing the work for the Ph.D. degree, he served as pastor of the First Baptist Church, Sioux Falls, South Dakota, and remained there until he accepted an invitation to become assistant professor of religious education in the Divinity School in 1926. In 1929 he was advanced to the rank of associate professor and in 1942 to a full professorship. He retired in 1952, thus serving on the faculty of the University for more than a quarter-century.

Professor Chave was one of America's outstanding leaders in the field of religious education, especially in research and in the development of a philosophy of that discipline. The titles of his books will indicate the growth of his interests. His first book, written with L. L. Thurston, *The Junior,* was based largely on experiments carried forward in the Sioux Falls church which he served as pastor and was an expansion of his doctoral thesis. His second book, *Supervision of Religious*

Education, expressed his concern for the improvement of techniques of supervision in order that religious education might take its proper place in guiding and enriching the lives of growing persons. His third book, *Personality Development of Children,* sought to give a comprehensive picture of the factors involved in the developing personality of the young, and especially of the significance of religion in this process. His fourth book, *A Functional Approach to Religious Education,* represented his most distinctive and original contribution, although it was foreshadowed in his earlier volumes. In it he underscores the primary function of religion, as he sees it, in promoting a healthy adjustment to life. Religious education, then, should be concerned with analyzing and identifying the experiences of persons at all age levels and with promoting those attitudes and processes which make for an integrated and socially effective life rather than in indoctrinating children and adults in traditional theological concepts, ancient rituals, and group mores. His point of view has properly been described as a revolutionary one.

In addition to his books, Professor Chave was the author of many articles and reports on research projects in various journals, especially in the *Journal of the Religious Education Association,* which organization he served as executive chairman in 1942–44. He was also a member of the International Council of Religious Education and contributed articles to its journal. His activities were not confined to the cloisters of the University, but he participated actively in many professional conferences throughout the country and directed experiments in various church schools and educational institutions. His interests were practical as well as theoretical, and he kept his feet firmly on the ground of actual experience.

In Professor Chave's passing, the Divinity School has lost one of its unfettered, original, and creative minds. His students remember with gratitude his guidance and inspiration. And his colleagues mourn the loss of a wise, loyal, and profoundly religious comrade.

As a human being, with broad sympathies and a great capacity for friendship, he won the respect and affection of those who knew him. He experienced sorrow and adversity, yet never showed bitterness or resentment. His home life was one in which the ties of effection and mutuality were strong. To his bereaved widow, Winifred, herself in frail health, to his daughter, Margaret (Mrs. Fallers), and to his sons, Grant and Keith, our deep and sincere sympathy is expressed.

Frederick W. Dietrich (1920) died on December 30, 1960, in Iowa City, Iowa.

Martin Fouts (1932–35) died of a cerebral hemorrhage on May 1, 1960. He had retired from the ministry several years previously.

CHANGE OF ALUMNI INFORMATION!

The Divinity School, in order to keep alumni information up to date, will print this Change of Information Form on the back cover of each issue of the *Divinity School News*. The form is for your convenience. Please use it when you have a change of address or a new position or if you have an interesting project under way. We need your co-operation in receiving this information promptly.

Date_____

Name _____

Year(s) in attendance at the Divinity School_____

Preferred Mailing
Address_____

I have Change of Information concerning:

☐ Address ☐ Position ☐ Other News

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please return this form to THE DIVINITY SCHOOL. THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, Chicago 37, Illinois.

[PRINTED IN U.S.A.]